DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 478 869 SO 035 144

AUTHOR	Brown, Sarah Drake; Patrick, John J.
TITLE	History Education in the United States: A Survey of Teacher Certification and State-Based Standards and Assessments for Teachers and Students.
SPONS AGENCY	American Historical Association, Washington, DC.; Organization of American Historians, Bloomington, IN.
PUB DATE	2003-06-28
NOTE	76p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Standards; Elementary Secondary Education; Graduation Requirements; *History Instruction; *State Standards; Student Evaluation; Surveys; *Teacher Certification
IDENTIFIERS	American Historical Association; *History Teachers; Organization of American Historians

ABSTRACT

The major goal of a study sponsored by the Organization of American Historians and the American Historical Association was to provide information about the state of history education in each of the United States, to be used constructively to appraise and improve school-based history education. This report addresses teacher certification in history; content standards in history for teachers; content standards in history for students; high school graduation and exit requirements in history; assessments in history; and resources and organizations that are available for history teachers at the state level. The report states that the researchers gathered most of their findings from state department of education Web sites and the Web sites of governing boards in the states. It explains that to confirm the accuracy of the data, the researchers wrote summary reports for each state and sent draft copies of these reports to social studies and history education specialists in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. It notes that representatives of 42 states responded; eight states and the District of Columbia did not respond to the survey. Three appendices contain: 12 data tables; a sample state profile (Indiana); and a list of respondents to the survey by state. (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 478 869

History Education in the United States

A Survey of Teacher Certification and State-Based Standards and Assessments for Teachers and Students

By Sarah Drake Brown
and
John J. Patrick

SO 035 144

Sponsored by the
American Historical Association
and the
Organization of American Historians

June 28, 2003

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J.J. Patrick

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Table of Contents

Summary of Findings, 3
1. Introduction to a Survey of State-Based Standards and Assessments for Teachers and Students, 8
2. Methods of Gathering and Verifying Data, 18
3. Findings about Certification of History Teachers, 21
4. Findings about Content Standards, 29
5. Findings about Graduation Requirements and Assessments, 41
6. Resources and Organizations for Teachers, 48
7. Concluding Comments about History Education in the United States, 49

Appendix A: Tables, 53

Table 1: High School Graduation Requirements and Exit Exams, 54
Table 2: Discipline-Based Standards, 58
Table 3: Standards Somewhat Grounded in History, 59
Table 4: Standards Not Grounded in History, 59
Table 5: States with No Standards, 59
Table 6: States in which Standards-Based Assessment Exists, 60
Table 7: States in which Standards-Based Assessment is in Development, 61
Table 8: States in which No Standards-Based Assessment Exists, 62
Table 9: Certification, 63
Table 10: States with University-Based Requirements, Proficiencies, and Testing, 65
Table 11: States with Specified Hours Required in History, 65
Table 12: States That Have Yet to Respond to the Survey, 65

Appendix B: Sample State Profile, Indiana, 66

Appendix C: List of Respondents to the Survey by State, 72

Acknowledgments, 75

About the Authors, 75

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

HISTORY EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES: A SURVEY OF TEACHER CERTIFICATION AND STATE-BASED STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS FOR TEACHERS AND STUDENTS

Sarah Drake Brown and John J. Patrick
June 28, 2003

In the spring of 2002, the Organization of American Historians and the American Historical Association launched a joint project designed to study the state of history education in each of the fifty states and in Washington, D.C. The two major professional organizations sponsoring the study expressed curiosity and concern about the teaching and learning of history nationwide. A major goal of the study is to provide information that can be used constructively to appraise and improve school-based history education.

The report addresses teacher certification in history; content standards in history for teachers; content standards in history for students; high school graduation and exit exam requirements in history; assessments in history; and resources and organizations that are available for history teachers at the state level. The researchers gathered most of their findings from state department of education websites and the websites of governing boards in the states. To confirm the accuracy of the data, they wrote summary reports for each state and sent draft copies of these reports to social studies and history education specialists in the fifty states and Washington, D.C. Representatives of 42 states responded. Eight states and Washington, D.C. did not respond to the survey.

Findings about Teacher Certification

In the United States, each state assumes responsibility for the licensure of its professionals. State departments of education, boards of education, or professional standards boards engage in the licensure of teachers. Teacher licensure, often referred to

in the lexicon interchangeably as certification, establishes and sets policies designed to distinguish between those who are qualified to teach and individuals who are not. While specific rules and procedures for certification vary from state to state, in general states follow similar guidelines. State governments tend not to emphasize history in their requirements for the certification of social studies teachers. Many universities require a major in history or the state recommends a major or significant hours in the completion of history courses, but no state requires a major in history for teachers who are licensed to teach history courses. To complicate matters further, states are often not forthcoming and bury their low requirements amidst claims of high quality. Here are highlights of our findings about teacher certification:

- Only 9 states require a minor in history for certification at the secondary level
- Only 2 states require a minor in history for certification in middle school
- 16 states leave certification to the discretion of the universities
- Certification in broad field social science or social studies is abundant

Findings about Teacher Content Standards

As part of the standards movement nationwide, some states have created content and performance standards for their teachers. Most states identify these standards as the minimal qualifications teachers are expected to demonstrate upon licensure. While many states have developed general standards for their teachers, this study investigated content and performance standards designed specifically for history, social science, or social studies teachers. Here is a summary of our findings about content standards for teachers:

- 13 states have no history, social science, or social studies content standards for teachers
- 11 states have history-specific content standards for teachers
- 9 states use NCATE standards (the NCSS Curriculum Standards for Social Studies)
- 12 states refer to their certification requirements in place of standards

Findings about Student Content Standards

National History Standards emerged in the 1990s as part of the federal government's Goals 2000 agenda. History was emphasized in Goal 3. Most of the states soon developed state content standards for their students. In each of the states (except Iowa and Rhode Island) and in the District of Columbia, content standards have been developed that pertain to history, the social sciences, or social studies. This study investigated whether or not states had created standards specific to the discipline of history and the extent to which these standards required students to engage in historical thinking. See the following list of findings about student content standards:

- 32 states have standards that recognize history as a discipline and make at least a minimal attempt to teach students how to think historically; the quality of these standards varies widely
- 12 states have standards that are somewhat grounded in history; these states emphasize content or historical thinking, but not both
- 5 states have written standards that are not grounded in history; these states' standards follow a general social studies model and do not emphasize content in history or historical thinking

Findings about High School Graduation Requirements and Assessment

The No Child Left Behind Act mandates that states assess students in mathematics and reading at every grade level by the 2005-2006 school year, and science examinations will be added by 2007-2008. Testing in history, the social sciences, or social studies is left to the discretion of the states. Here is a summary of findings about graduation requirements and assessment:

- 30 states and the District of Columbia require students to take United States history in order to graduate from high school
- 12 states and the District of Columbia require students to take world history for graduation purposes
- 10 states require students to take credits or units in social studies; specifications regarding history courses under this social studies credit are unclear
- 16 states administer criterion-referenced or standards-based tests to their students in history, the social sciences, or social studies
- 12 states are in the process of developing standards-based assessment for their students; 3 of these states have suspended the administration of these assessments
- 22 states and Washington, D.C. do not currently have standards-based assessment in history, the social sciences, or social studies

Concluding Comments about History Education in the United States

This study sought to provide an overview of the state of history education as it exists currently in the United States. The purpose of this study was not to "rate" or "grade" the states with respect to their certification policies, substantive quality of standards, assessments, graduation requirements, and resources and organizations for

teacher membership. Rather, we sought to organize the data in a comprehensible form in order to foster further discussion about the extent to which history is or is not emphasized in certification, curricular standards, graduation requirements, and assessments. The information gathered in this survey is intended to promote deliberative discussions about the state of precollegiate history education and to encourage historians, history teachers, school administrators, and policymakers to work in collaboration to improve the teaching and learning of history nationwide. The information we have reported is not altogether positive. Yet, we remain optimistic that strong content standards, standards-based assessments, and improved licensure requirements will assist Americans in enhancing history education and elevating student achievement.

1. INTRODUCTION TO A SURVEY OF STATE-BASED STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS FOR TEACHERS AND STUDENTS

In the spring of 2002, the Organization of American Historians and the American Historical Association launched a joint project designed to study the state of history education in each of the fifty states and in Washington, DC. The two major professional organizations sponsoring the study expressed curiosity and concern about the teaching and learning of history nationwide. The OAH approached Dr. John J. Patrick, professor of education at Indiana University and director of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education and of the Social Studies Development Center at IU, with the idea of conducting a study to provide information on history education that has been previously unavailable in a comprehensive form. Dr. Patrick agreed to lead the project and construct a report addressing several issues pertaining to history education. As his graduate student assistant, he asked me to join the study. Our report addresses teacher certification in history; content standards in history for teachers; content standards in history for students; high school graduation and exit exam requirements in history; assessments in history; and resources and organizations that are available for history teachers at the state level.

A Rising Interest in History Education

A heightened interest in history education prompted this study. During the last 20 years, history educators have noted a sea change in the concern expressed by scholars, policymakers, and the general public about the teaching and learning of history in schools. The 1983 report, *A Nation at Risk*, was a catalyst for this movement with its focused attention and support for a core curriculum based in academic subjects. Subsequent movements for national goals, national standards, and history specific testing

in the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) illustrated the influence of *A Nation at Risk* and the growing concern for a substantive, strengthened academic core curriculum.

President George H. W. Bush summoned the fifty governors to Charlottesville, Virginia in 1989 in order to address the perceived educational crisis identified by *A Nation at Risk*. The state governors proposed National Education Goals, and the Bush Administration adopted these goals in 1990. A bipartisan consensus developed around the issue of education, and support grew for "world-class" standards. In 1991 Congress passed the America 2000 Act, and Congressmen renewed the call for national standards in 1994 by passing President Clinton's Goals 2000: Educate America Act. Goal 3 addressed specifically the study of history as a school subject.[1]

Concentrating on Student Achievement and Citizenship, Goal 3 set the bar high with the challenge that by the year 2000:

> American students will leave grades four, eight, and twelve having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, history, and geography; and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our modern economy.

The singling out of history as an academic discipline worthy of study, as opposed to the general field of social studies, represented a significant shift in American educational thought. When the federal government commissioned the construction of recommended national standards, governing bodies specified the creation of standards in history and in

social science disciplines. The federal government's call for history, not social studies, standards set the tone for the subsequent standards movements in the fifty states that make up our federal system. While many states continued to use "social studies" as an overarching label, 32 states currently use the discipline of history as a major basis for their standards.

Since *A Nation at Risk*, the content of the National Assessment in Educational Progress (NAEP) has also shifted. Before 1986, there was no NAEP in history; the exams focused on citizenship and social studies. In 1986, the Educational Excellence Network, with support from the National Endowment for the Humanities, conducted a NAEP-related examination for 11th graders in United States history and literature. In 1988 a fully developed NAEP in U.S. history was administered at grade 4, grade 8, and grade 12. The rising public interest in students' knowledge and understanding of United States history prompted a shift in the content and design of the NAEP from general social studies to a U.S. history-based NAEP.

The National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) assumes the responsibility for selecting subject areas for assessment, developing objectives and frameworks, and identifying goals appropriate for each age and grade. The NAGB contracted the Council of Chief State School Officers to conduct a project between August 1991 and July 1992 to develop a new framework and specifications for a 1994 NAEP in United States history. The American Historical Association, American Institutes for Research, National Council for History Education, and the National Council for the Social Studies joined this consensus project.[2] The Council of Chief State School Officers, the Center for Civic Education, and the American Institutes for Research collaborated in the creation of a

similar framework for civics in 1998. Both the 1994 NAEP in U.S. history and the 1998 NAEP in civics have proven to be finely tuned and developed frameworks, and they are likely to be used in the future. In 2005 there will be the first NAEP in world history.

We have witnessed a gradual yet momentous shift in the emphasis of academic disciplines in our nation's schools. During the 1970s, social studies dominated its portion of the school curriculum. Gradually, the influence of social studies faded, and, as demonstrated through our national goals, national standards, and NAEP examinations, history has reemerged as a strong force in the curriculum of schools. History education is on the rise. New programs and developments indicate that history will continue to be significant in the school curriculum.

Programs and Developments in History Education

The Teaching American History Grants, proposed by Senator Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia, have had a sweeping impact on history education nationwide. Two years ago, Senator Byrd led an effort to improve history education at the high school level by securing governmental support for the appropriation of fifty million dollars to the Department of Education to improve and enhance the teaching of American history. Last year the government appropriated one hundred million dollars for these Byrd Grants.

President Bush is also taking an active role in the current history teaching initiative. On September 17, 2002, appropriately the 215th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution, the President announced a three-part plan that involves the National Endowment for the Humanities, National History Day, and the National Archives and Records Administration. Elements of this plan incorporate an expansion of the NEH's "We the People" project to include a nationwide high school essay contest for juniors, the

focus of which emphasizes how a significant event in U.S. history illustrates American democratic principles. The NEH is also sponsoring a lecture series on Heroes in History, while National History Day and the National Archives are creating a project entitled "Our Documents." This project examines one hundred milestone American documents that have shaped us as a people – from Richard Henry Lee's 1776 resolution calling for the colonies to be free and independent states to the Voting Rights Act of 1965.[3] In addition, the White House convened a forum on American History, Civics, and Service in May 2003, which emphasized the importance of history in the core curriculum of schools.

Tennessee Senator Lamar Alexander also issued a recent call for improved history education. His bill (now a law), "The American History and Civics Education Act," first establishes grants for up to 12 Presidential Academies for American History and Civics Teachers. The academies will be run in the summer and offer two week programs for K-12 teachers. Second, the bill calls for the creation of up to 12 Congressional Academies for Students of American History and Civics. At these Academies, four week summer programs will be offered for outstanding juniors and seniors in high school. Third, the bill provides for a National Alliance of Teachers of American History and Civics. As part of this Alliance, one national grant will be awarded each year to facilitate a sharing of ideas in content and pedagogy among history and civics teachers. Twenty-five million dollars will be authorized each year for the pilot program grants.[4] Alexander's bill passed in Congress in June 2003.

Improving Teacher Education

In concert with a rising interest in history education, there is concern about the quality of teacher education and teacher certification. Many researchers, theorists, and specialists have weighed in on the issue of teacher certification. Points of contention revolve around central questions: For what does the teaching license stand? Is a "highly qualified" teacher a "high quality" teacher? What influence does teacher certification have on students' academic achievement? And, to what extent are teachers of history certified to teach the discipline?

Title II of the 1998 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act requires the Secretary of Education to issue reports to Congress describing the state of teacher quality nationwide. In June of 2002, Secretary of Education Roderick Paige released the first of these reports, *Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge*. In this report, Paige issued a call to action demanding that states transform their certification systems radically by raising standards and lowering barriers that prevent persons whom the federal government considers to be highly qualified candidates from pursuing careers as teachers. The No Child Left Behind Act requires that by the end of the 2005-2006 school year all teachers of core academic subjects be highly qualified. Congress defines highly qualified teachers as teachers "who not only possess full state certification but also have solid content knowledge of the subjects they teach."[5] In spite of this Congressional definition, the issue of full certification and what it entails remains contested.

A 2001 study issued by the Abell Foundation, *Teacher Certification Reconsidered: Stumbling for Quality*, challenges the worth of traditional certification programs. Secretary Paige cited this study in his report. The Abell Foundation's research,

conducted largely by economists and social scientists, demonstrates that certified teachers are not more effective than uncertified teachers. Their report suggests that effective teachers are those who have a positive impact on student achievement, and they contend that a teacher's general academic background and verbal ability are more important than education acquired in a school of education.[6]

Linda Darling-Hammond, professor of education at Stanford University and the Founding Executive Director of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, challenges the Abell Report. In her response, Darling-Hammond documents what she perceives to be inaccuracies in the Abell Report. Darling-Hammond examines methodological issues concerning the validity and interpretation of research, and she presents data that challenges the Abell Foundation's position regarding teacher certification.[7] Kate Walsh, senior policy analyst of the Abell Foundation, issued a rejoinder calling into question the usefulness of the studies to which Darling-Hammond referred.[8]

Another recent study conducted in Arizona by Ildiko Laczko-Kerr of the Arizona Department of Education and David C. Berliner of Arizona State University examined the effectiveness of the Teach for America program. In short, Teach for America enables candidates who hold a bachelor's degree, a 2.5 GPA at the time of application, and an interest in teaching to teach in schools for two years. Labeling the program "a case of harmful public policy," the authors contend that teachers' certification status does matter when it comes to students' performance. Results indicate that students whose teachers were uncertified were academically two months behind the students of certified teachers

by the end of the school year.[9] However, most studies about teacher preparation and certification pertain to science and mathematics and not to history or social studies.

Debates about certification also involve discussions related to out-of-field teaching, and much research pertaining to history education has been conducted in this area. A June 2002 article in *Education Week* revealed that "more than half of the nation's middle school students and a quarter of its high school students are learning core academic subjects from teachers who lack certification in those subjects and did not major in them in college." Richard Ingersoll, an associate professor of education at the University of Pennsylvania, commented, "In hospitals, except in an emergency, you won't see a cardiologist delivering a baby. But in schools, the assumption is, 'Oh, gosh, you don't have to be that smart. Teaching English, teaching math, what's the difference?'"[10]

According to the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics School and Staffing Survey, in 1999-2000 71% of middle school history teachers lacked a major or certification in history; and 11.5% lacked a major, a minor, or certification. At the high school level, 62.5% lacked a major or certification in history and 8.4% lacked a major, minor, or certification. The results for social science teachers were not quite as staggering, but they were significant nonetheless. If we examine change, the most striking data is that the percentage *increased* since 1987-1988 for middle and high school teachers who had neither a major nor certification. The high school increase was slight – 62.1% to 62.5%. But at the middle school level, out-of-field teachers increased from 67.5% to 71%.[11] In a separate article, appropriately entitled, "All Talk, No Action," Craig Jerald and Richard Ingersoll noted that out-of-field teaching is

not necessarily due to teacher shortages – especially in such fields as social studies. Instead, teacher misassignment is the culprit.[12] The situation is complicated further in high poverty and high minority schools where not only initial teacher qualifications but teacher retention remains a key concern.

The twenty year anniversary of *A Nation at Risk* has contributed to the continuing discussion on teacher education and certification. In the Hoover Institution's publication, *Our Schools & Our Future...Are We Still at Risk?* the Koret Task Force on K-12 Education concluded that the United States still needs fundamental changes in the incentive structure and power relationships that exist in our nation's schools. The task force has offered recommendations based on three principles – accountability, choice, and transparency – in order to improve American schools.[13] No doubt, debates will continue over issues related to teacher education and teacher certification. We cannot be certain if we as a nation should dismantle completely our current certification systems or if we should reconstruct existing structures. We do know, however, that we must educate and prepare teachers who are simultaneously content scholars and experts in pedagogical content knowledge. This study focuses primarily on the content knowledge expected of those educators certified to teach history and the knowledge of history and historical thinking skills that their students are expected to achieve and demonstrate.

Notes, Section 1

---

[1] Linda Symcox, *Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in American Classrooms* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2002), 9.
[2] NAEP U.S. History Consensus Project,*U .S. History Framework for the 1994 National Assessment of Educational Progress* (Washington, D.C.: National Assessment Governing Board, 1994), 1-6.
[3] Ira Berlin and Lee W. Formwalt, "White House Initiative on American History" *OAH Newsletter* 30 (November 2002): 1, 12.
[4] "Senator Alexander Proposes American History, Civics Education" posted March 4, 2003, http://www.chattanoogan.com/articles/article_33337.asp

[5] U.S. Department of Education, *Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge*, (Jessup, MD: ED Pubs, 2002), vii.

[6] The Abell Foundation, *Teacher Certification Reconsidered: Stumbling for Quality* (Baltimore: The Abell Foundation, 2001). Retrieved 10/01/02 from http://www.abell.org/publications/index.asp

[7] Linda Darling-Hammond, "Research and Rhetoric on Teacher Certification: A Response to 'Teacher Certification Reconsidered,'" *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 10, no. 36 (6 September 2002). Retrieved 10/01/02 from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n36.html

[8] Kate Walsh, *Teacher Certification Reconsidered: Stumbling for Quality – A Rejoinder*. (November 2001) Retrieved 10/01/02 from http://www.abell.org/publications/index.asp

[9] Ildiko Laczko-Kerr and David C. Berliner, "The Effectiveness of 'Teach for America' and Other Under-certified Teachers on Student Academic Achievement: A Case of Harmful Public Policy," *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 10, no. 37 (6 September 2002). Retrieved 10/01/02 from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n37/

[10] Catherine Gewertz, "Qualifications of Teachers Falling Short," *Education Week* XXI, no. 40 (June 12, 2002).

[11] As reported in Catherine Gewertz, "Qualifications of Teachers Falling Short," *Education Week* XXI, no. 40 (June 12, 2002).

[12] Craig D. Jerald and Richard M. Ingersoll, "All Talk, No Action: Putting an End to Out-of-Field Teaching," *The Education Trust* (August 2002). Retrieved 10/01/02 from http://www.edtrust.org/main/documents/AllTalk.pdf

[13] Paul E. Peterson, ed., *Our Schools & Our Future...Are We Still at Risk?* (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 2003).

2. METHODS OF GATHERING AND VERIFYING DATA

One of the major goals of this survey of precollegiate history education in the fifty states and Washington, D.C. is the creation and maintenance of a public website that provides information about the teaching of history in each of the states. The Organization of American Historians requested specifically that the information we gathered for this website pertain to the following categories:

- certification requirements for history teachers at the elementary, middle, and high school levels
- standards in history for teachers
- standards in history for the K-12 curriculum
- high school graduation requirements and exit examination requirements in history
- state criterion-referenced examinations in history
- statewide resources for history teachers and contact information for state history/social studies specialists
- statewide associations for teacher membership

In order to assemble this massive amount of data, we broke our research into several steps. The research process involved independent searches for data, preliminary public presentations of initial findings, and early contact with numerous representatives in history education from each of the states and the District of Columbia. As directed by the OAH, we started the survey by examining history education in five states: California, Florida, Illinois, New York, and Texas. The OAH recommended we begin with these states because their large populations have made them influential nationally.

We utilizied the websites created and maintained by the various departments of education and certifying bodies in each of the states. An abundant amount of information now appears online, and we were able to employ these resources to collect much of the necessary data. We used the information to compile individual reports for each state, and we organized the reports into sections based on the categories listed above (see Appendix B for the report compiled for Indiana, which is an example of the complete series of reports on the states). After writing these reports, we moved into the second stage of our research process.

We decided to publicize the study in its nascent stages and thereby to encourage conversations about the project and receive as much feedback as possible. Therefore, in November 2002 we presented a report at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies in Phoenix, Arizona. At this session, we provided general background information about the purpose and methods of the study and the intended outcomes, including the posting of findings on a website of the OAH. We distributed relevant copies of ERIC digests pertaining to history education and draft copies of the state reports. Wishing not to report our findings prematurely, we provided only general introductory information about the study and welcomed the feedback and suggestions provided by the audience.

At the American Historical Association's Annual Meeting in Chicago, Illinois in January 2003, we followed a similar format. After a general presentation of the purpose and methods of the study, we compared state standards in Illinois, Indiana, and Texas. The intent of this comparative presentation was to demonstrate to the audience a small capsule of what our larger, final report would entail. By April 2003, at the Organization

of American Historians' annual meeting in Memphis, Tennessee, we were ready to reveal many of our findings, and we distributed drafts of tables consisting of compiled data. At the Memphis session we also shared a generalizations sheet that summarized the key areas of the study and highlighted items of significance pertaining to certification, teacher and student content standards, graduation requirements, and assessments in history. We provided an overview of the entire study and distributed a Summary of Findings at the Innovations in Collaboration Conference in Alexandria, Virginia on June 28, 2003.

The third stage of our research occurred concurrently with the presentations made in Phoenix, Chicago, and Memphis. After the completion of the individual state reports, we sent copies of each report and a response sheet to history education specialists in each state. Contacts in the states included:

- National Council for the Social Studies State Executive Directors and Boards
- National Council for History Education State Representatives
- Members of the Council of State Social Studies Specialists (an NCSS group)
- Certification Offices and/or State Departments of Education

The rate of response we received varied. In some states as many as three individuals completed a response form and provided feedback regarding the accuracy of their state's report. In eight states and in Washington, D.C., we received no response. The eight states that did not provide information are listed in Table 12 in Appendix A. (For a complete listing of the individuals who assisted us in this study by reading and approving or editing their state's report, see Appendix C.) We now turn to the information we gathered in this national survey on history education.

3. FINDINGS ABOUT CERTIFICATION OF HISTORY TEACHERS

In the United States, each state assumes responsibility for the licensure of its professionals. State departments of education, boards of education, or professional standards boards engage in the licensure of teachers. Teacher licensure, often referred to in the lexicon interchangeably as certification, establishes and sets policies designed to distinguish between those who are qualified to teach and individuals who are not. While specific rules and procedures for certification vary from state to state, in general states follow similar guidelines. State legislatures often establish laws pertaining to teacher licensure, colleges and universities submit proposals for "certification programs" based on state guidelines, and the state grants the institution approval. Once the approved college or university in the state pronounces a student fit to teach, the state usually deems the student "certified," and the individual is recognized as a licensed teacher. However, several factors complicate this seemingly simple process.

For what does the teaching license stand? The No Child Left Behind Act stipulates that by the 2005-2006 school year every classroom teacher must be "highly qualified." The idea of what constitutes a highly qualified teacher can be interpreted in multiple ways. For example, is a "highly qualified" teacher necessarily the same as a "high quality" teacher? Specialists are trying to refine the definition of highly qualified teachers, and researchers are conducting numerous studies regarding the benefits and the questionable aspects of approved certification programs in the states and of their "alternative" counterparts.[1] Our interest in this report centers not on the discussions taking place regarding the positive and negative characteristics of schools of education and their practice of regulating certification. Instead, given that licensure is necessary in

each of the states and in Washington, D.C., our sponsors expressed interest in the specific requirements needed to be licensed to teach history, regardless of how these requirements are met. Let us now turn to Table 9 in Appendix A to engage in a close examination of the certification policies in each of the fifty states and Washington, D.C. for teachers licensed to teach history at the elementary, middle, and high school levels.

Certification Requirements in History

As illustrated in the Certification and Standards Key in Table 9, considerable variation exists among the states in regard to certification.[2] When examining the systems established by the states, we find that four approaches prevail. First, some states often require teacher candidates to demonstrate they have taken a certain number of *hours* in a discipline or field of study. These hours might or might not correspond with an academic major or minor. Second, some states are moving away from course hour specifications and instead require their licensed teachers to have demonstrated *proficiency* in the subject. To demonstrate proficiency, candidates often complete portfolios and pass examinations as required by the state. Third, as mentioned previously, many states establish laws relevant to certification and then allow universities to create approved certification programs for their students. However, sixteen states appear not to have established legislation pertaining to certification, leaving the matter up to the discretion of the universities. These *university-based* requirements often vary within the state. And fourth, many states insist that their teachers pass state administered content tests in order to be certified. In four states we were able to find reference to passing a *content test* as the only requirement for certification. As illustrated by the many categories designated in

Table 9, a wide variation exists among the states in regard to their certification requirements for teachers of history.

To complicate matters further, states that have passed legislation regarding requirements for teacher certification often bury their low requirements amidst claims of high standards. According to data obtained through state department of education websites, no state requires teachers to hold a major in history to be able to teach history courses in our nation's schools. Having made this statement, it is important to note two important words: *state* and *requires*. Many universities require a major in history as part of their state-approved certification programs, and states may recommend that teacher candidates hold a major or states may recommend that significant hours to be taken in history in order to be certified. The states' policies and *calls* for a history major in essence amount to little more than suggestions since a major in history is not *required* by any state. Only nine states require a minor in history for certification at the secondary level, and this number drops to two states when the level of certification is the middle school. Furthermore, many states do not specify the number of hours in history that are required for elementary licensure. For illustrative purposes regarding elementary, middle, and secondary certification, let us turn to the state of Indiana.

As in many other states, Indiana does not specify requirements in history for teachers certified at the elementary level. The state suggests that elementary teachers take "courses" in United States history and world history, and they must pass a content test appropriate for elementary school teachers. At the middle school and high school levels, certification requirements are based on the state's standards for teachers. The standards encompass nine strands: civic ideals, current events, economics, geographical

perspectives, government and citizenship, historical perspectives, psychology, sociology, and world cultures. Candidates for middle school and high school licensure are expected to "complete preparation" in each of the strands. Six areas of specific concentration have been identified by the state: economics, geographical perspectives, government and citizenship, historical perspectives, psychology, and sociology. High school teachers are to choose three areas of concentration, and they will be licensed in these three areas. Middle school teachers are to select one area of concentration, but they will be certified in all six areas.

The coursework required for concentration in historical perspectives is not specified in the Professional Standards Board's documents. It seems probable that high school teachers in Indiana could be licensed to teach history without having significant preparation in the discipline. We know for certain that middle school teachers can be certified to teach United States history or world history with minimal exposure to the study of history in college.

It is well known that most universities require all of their students to complete, at the minimum, survey courses in many areas in order to fulfill general studies requirements. Some universities in Indiana do go beyond the state's requirements and specify that their graduates must have a major in history or at least have taken a certain number of hours in history in order to be recommended to the state for certification. Regardless of the good intentions and practices of the universities, the point holds that at the state level Indiana does not deem it necessary to *require* teachers it allows to teach history to have significant content knowledge in the discipline.

Indiana is not the only state in which this situation exists. In Arkansas, high school social studies teachers are certified in broad field social studies. They are required to have a college major in one of the disciplines comprising social studies. This major could very well be history. However, a teacher in the state of Arkansas could have a college major in economics and be certified in broad field social studies. As a result, this economics major, while most likely very competent in economics, could teach United States history and world history without ever having studied the discipline in depth at the university level. Such broad field certification in social studies is abundant.

States' requirements are also often misleading. In Nebraska, history teachers in grades 7-12 must have a history endorsement consisting of 36 hours including 30 hours in history and at least 6 hours in one or more social science areas. One would be led to believe that Nebraska's policy represents high certification standards. That is, however, not the case. A social studies endorsement of 60 semester hours in all social science fields will also certify one as a history teacher. The state does not specify how many hours of the 60 required must be in history. Many other states exhibit requirements similar to those of the states singled out in this report.

There are several positive signs in the preparation of history teachers in some states. Alaska allows its universities to set requirements for its elementary teachers, while the state mandates that history teachers at both the middle and secondary levels have a minor, or 18 semester hours, in history to be licensed to teach the subject. Connecticut stipulates that its elementary teachers must have at least three hours in United States history, 15 hours in history to teach in middle schools, and 18 hours in history to teach in high schools. Rhode Island requires 24 hours in history in order for a teacher to be

licensed at the high school level. While 24 hours in the discipline appears impressive relatively, we must remember that this requirement does not constitute the rigor deemed necessary for a major.

Some states are involved currently in a movement away from course hour specifications and toward a demonstration of proficiency in order to fulfill certification requirements. New Hampshire, North Carolina, Vermont, Wisconsin, and Wyoming have either instituted the use of proficiencies or are in the process of doing so. In Wisconsin, for example, a new law stipulates that to achieve certification teachers must demonstrate competency in the subjects they will teach. Each university in the state is in the process of devising appropriate coursework and testing that will enable candidates to demonstrate competency and obtain licensure. The law will go into effect in 2004. Teachers at all three levels will be required to demonstrate competency, and those who are certified as social studies teachers in grades 7-12 will be responsible for proving they are capable of teaching content found in the Wisconsin Model Academic Social Studies Standards.

Alternative Certification

While each state and Washington, D.C. has in some way devised procedures for the licensure of its teachers, not all educators have followed traditional routes to certification. Alternative forms of certification have flourished in recent years as non-traditional teacher candidates enter the ranks of the profession. According to a study published in 2003 by the National Center for Education Statistics, forty-six states and Washington, D.C. currently have alternative certification programs in place. Two hundred thousand educators have become certified through alternative programs since 1985, including 25,000 new teachers per year for the past five years. According to the

Center's 2003 report, 18% of California's new hires achieved certification through alternative routes while 24% of New Jersey's new hires obtained certification through alternative means. In the state of Texas 52 alternative routes to teacher certification exist, and 24% of the state's new teaching corps comes from these programs.[3]

The federal government supports alternative certification routes, having allocated $41.65 million to the alternative program, Transition to Teaching, in the 2003 fiscal budget. At this point a consensus does not yet exist as to how alternative routes for certification should be defined, and the states have a tendency to design their own programs and develop their own labels for these programs. Overall, alternative certification refers to all avenues of licensure available to those wishing to teach who already hold a bachelor's degree. Candidates certified through alternative routes are considered to be fully licensed teachers, as opposed to those operating under "emergency" status. States do not formally provide specific information regarding alternative certification in history; instead individuals wishing to enroll in alternative programs must adhere to the general requirements of the program as they pertain to their specific subject area.

Implications of the No Child Left Behind Act

The No Child Left Behind Act requires that by the 2005-2006 school year a "highly qualified" teacher should be in every classroom. Congress defines highly qualified teachers as "those who not only possess full state certification but also have solid content knowledge of the subjects they teach."[4] Elementary teachers will be required to pass subject matter and teaching skills tests in reading, math, and writing and pass appropriate tests in other areas of the elementary curriculum. Middle and high

school teachers will have to pass rigorous subject-matter tests or have an academic major, graduate degree, the equivalent of an undergraduate major, or advanced certification in the academic subject they teach.[5] In their response to our survey, several states indicated that they were "scrambling" to adjust their licensure programs to meet the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act.

Teacher certification was the primary point of interest of the sponsors of this survey, and it has remained a central point of focus throughout the research process. Other questions about history education grew out of the initial emphasis on teacher certification. Logically, concerns in relation to content standards for both students and teachers emerged as part of discussions regarding certification. Therefore, let us turn to Table 9 for an examination of content standards in history for teachers and Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 for an examination of content standards in history for students.

Notes, Section 3

---

[1] For examples of some of the discussions taking place, see Sandra Vergari and Frederick M. Hess, "The Accreditation Game," *Education Next* 2 (Fall 2002): 48-57; Mary E. Diez, "The Certification Connection," *Education Next* 2 (Spring 2002): 8-15;. James W. Fraser, "A Tenuous Hold," *Education Next* 2 (Spring 2002): 16-21; Frederick M. Hess, "Break the Link," *Education Next* 2 (Spring 2002): 22-28; Betty Castor, "Better Assessment for Better Teaching," *Education Week* (December 11, 2002): 28, 30; Arthur E. Wise, "What's Wrong With Teacher Certification?" *Education Week* (April 9, 2003), http://www.edweek.org/ew/ewstory.cfm?slug=30wise.h22&keywords=Wise; Patrick F. Bassett, "Searching for Great Teachers," *Education Week* (February 26, 2003): 26, 28; "Who Is and Who Isn't Qualified to Teach?" *Washington Post* (October 1, 2002), A11.

[2] It should be noted that despite variation among the states in certification requirements, 41 states have signed the NASDTEC (National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification) Interstate Contract for Reciprocity. In addition, some states accept teachers' credentials from another state if they graduated from an NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) approved institution. Agreements among states also exist through NERC (Northeast Regional Credential, including Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont) and the MOINKSA (Missouri, Oklahoma, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, South Dakota, and Arkansas) Agreement. See C. Emily Feistritzer and David T. Chester, *Alternative Teacher Certification: A State-by-State Analysis 2003* (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Information, 2003), 27.

[3] Ibid., 3-13.

[4] U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, Office of Policy Planning and Innovation, *Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge: The Secretary's Annual Report on Teacher Quality* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 2002), vii.

[5] Ibid., 5.

4. FINDINGS ABOUT CONTENT STANDARDS

National History Standards emerged in the 1990s as part of the federal government's Goals 2000 agenda. History was emphasized in Goal 3. To address adequately all aspects of standards pertaining to history, we examine history content standards for both teachers and students.

Content Standards for Teachers

As indicated in Table 9, thirty-four states have developed content standards for teachers in social studies or the social sciences, and 11 of these states have developed history-specific content standards. These states are identified in Table 9 as YH in the Teacher Standards column on the far right. The content standards in these eleven states (Alabama, California, Idaho [U.S., not world history standards], Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, New Mexico, North Dakota, Texas, and Vermont) specify, to differing degrees, the content that teachers of history should master in order to meet the standard for teachers of the discipline.

As an example of the differences that exist among the states, let us first examine the content standards in history for two states, Indiana and Illinois. In Indiana there are thirteen standards for teachers of social studies. In each standard, instructors are expected to demonstrate performances, knowledge, and dispositions related to a specific teaching area or practice. Indiana's content standards for teachers, while having a designation (historical perspectives) for history, actually fail to specify content knowledge teachers should possess. Among the three descriptors written in the knowledge section of this historical perspectives standard, Indiana writes vaguely that teachers are expected to

"identify and describe selected historical periods and patterns of change within and across cultures."

Illinois has developed core content standards for all social science teachers and specific standards designations for six disciplines. The history designation consists of eight standards that refer to content knowledge in United States history, world history, and Illinois history. The first six standards address specific time periods about which teachers are expected to be knowledgeable, while standards seven and eight require teachers to be aware of comparative history and historical interpretations. Knowledge and performance indicators exist under each of the standards. While these knowledge and performance indicators are not overly specific, they do clearly require content knowledge and accompanying performance skills to be demonstrated by teachers. For example, under Standard 1, the performance indicator identifies a competent teacher as one who "assesses factors that contributed to the Age of Exploration and evaluates the consequences of the Columbian Exchange." This indicator lacks specificity in its description of expectations; yet, it describes what history teachers should know and be able to do to a greater extent than does the indicator in Indiana. Furthermore, when combined with indicators in Illinois' Standard 8, which relate to historical interpretation and historiography, it becomes clear that teachers are expected to be aware of differing interpretations and research in the discipline. Although it is not listed specifically, well prepared teachers might implicitly incorporate Standard 8 and draw upon Alfred W. Crosby's *Ecological Imperialism: The Biological Expansion of Europe, 900-1900*, when designing lessons. Illinois' content standards for history teachers provide a broad

framework that is based in content knowledge without inundating teachers with specificity.

The Indiana and Illinois examples illustrate that significant differences exist among the content standards for teachers in the eleven states having history specific standards. Twenty-three states also have content standards that pertain to history or social studies, but these states take varying approaches to the standards. The 23 states in this category (listed in Table 9 as YHCERT, CERT, NCATE, and Y) use either their certification requirements as standards, refer to the specifications designated by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), or have developed social studies standards. Twelve states use their certification requirements as standards. It should be noted that while Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Virginia, and Wyoming use their certification requirements as standards, their certification requirements focus specifically on history content. For example, in Virginia, the history certification regulations/teacher content standards provide general content specifications similar to those found in Illinois. One world history standard requires teachers to know "the culture and ideas of the Renaissance and Reformation, European exploration, and the origins of capitalism and colonialism." The standard is broad, but content is at least included.

The 7 other states (see Table 9) that refer to their certification requirements (CERT) for standards do not specify content in history. Nine states use NCATE requirements as their content standards. NCATE requirements draw upon documents written by the National Council for the Social Studies, and the criteria established by NCSS focuses on the organization's Ten Themes. History is identified vaguely and

vacuously as "Time, Continuity, and Change." States that draw upon the NCATE/NCSS requirements have developed teacher standards that are not grounded in the discipline of history. Two states, Arkansas and Connecticut (labeled Y on Table 9), have developed content standards for their teachers, but these standards are not history specific.

Thirteen states have not established content standards for history, social science, or social studies teachers. Wisconsin and New Jersey are in the process of doing so, and definitive information pertaining to Nebraska and Washington, D.C. has not been located.

Content Standards for Students

States have been involved in the standards movement to a great degree by creating content standards for their students (see Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5). Only two states, Iowa and Rhode Island, have not written state standards for students. Iowa remains committed to local control and, as a matter of state policy, has not created standards. Rhode Island advises its teachers to draw upon the recommendations made in numerous national standards documents when making curricular decisions. The remaining forty-eight states and Washington, D.C. have established content standards of various sorts in multiple subjects for students.

When we began this portion of our research, we attempted to organize the states' standards by first asking this question: Does the state have standards that are specific to the discipline of history? States complicated this yes/no question because a few states have developed standards organized along disciplines at the high school level but have taken an approach much more associated with "social studies" for K-8 students. In these states, discipline-based standards are encouraged at the high school level, and we can recognize easily the integrity of each discipline. In other words, separate standards

usually exist. At the elementary level standards are not listed separately in different disciplines.

We resolved this dilemma by determining if the standards at the elementary level appeared to address the study of history and promote the acquisition of content knowledge in the discipline, regardless of their label. If they did so, we considered them to be organized around a discipline. Also note that in some states there was a slight discrepancy regarding the specificity and substantiality of the content in the standards for grades K-3 and grades 4-12. See Tables 2 and 3 to identify these states.

We addressed a second question about education in the discipline of history: How do the states address the concept of historical thinking? To be placed in the *discipline-based* category, state standards were expected not only to demonstrate content recognizable as pertaining directly to history; they also needed to require students to engage in historical thinking. Historical thinking, as outlined in Chapter 2 of *National Standards for History*,[1] compels students to demonstrate chronological thinking, historical understanding, historical analysis and interpretation, historical research capabilities, and historical issues-analysis and decision-making. We determined that to be considered *discipline-based* state standards needed at minimum an attempt to engage students in historical thinking.

In 32 states there are standards that recognize history as a discipline and make at least a minimal attempt to teach students how to think historically. As Table 2 indicates, we created three subcategories for the 32 states that fell under the *discipline-based* classification for students' content standards in history. These categories pertained to the

history content in the standards and for simplicity were labeled *content high*, *content medium*, and *content low*. We also used these subcategories in Tables 3 and 4.

We rank 14 states as holding the status of *discipline-based, content high* in this survey. These 14 states emphasized periodization in their standards and included substantial and specific content examples (a description of the standards in one of these states, Indiana, appears later in this section).

Fourteen other states earned a *discipline-based, content medium* ranking. Each of these 14 states emphasized periodization, but they tended merely to list eras or periods instead of making these eras or periods relate directly to the standards they had written. In addition, the 14 states considered *content medium* in the *discipline-based* category made vague references to "major events" instead of outlining specific content information that was to be addressed. Some gaps in content and chronological leaps also existed in these standards (a description of the standards in one of these states, Illinois, also appears later in this section).

Four states fell into the category labeled *discipline-based, content low*. These states provided minimal content examples or merely provided lists of historical people, places, and events that students should know. The state of Hawaii is included in this category. Hawaii explains that their "historical framework" is not a checklist of subjects and is instead designed to provide topics through which the standards can be implemented. Nevertheless, in Hawaii and in other states in this category, these lists were seldom connected directly to standards.

Twelve states have created standards that fall into the second major category we developed, *somewhat grounded in history*. Six states in this category were considered to

be *content medium*, and six states were ranked as *content low*. As described in Table 3, the major criteria we used for labeling a state as *somewhat grounded in history* revolved again around both history content and historical thinking. States that fell into this middle category emphasized historical content *or* historical thinking in their standards, but they did not adequately address both areas. Oftentimes these states referred to general "skills" instead of the specific qualities of historical thinking as outlined in the National Standards publication. Other states placed an emphasis on historical thinking but did not specify the content about which the students were to think. In this middle category, the subdivisions of *content medium* and *content low* followed specifications similar to those identified in the *discipline-based* category. The state of Alaska fell into the *somewhat grounded in history, content low* category. In Alaska, four major content standards in history exist. These standards emphasize historical thinking, calling on students to understand chronology and interpretation and to be able to comprehend continuity and change. No specific references to content exist in Alaska's four history standards. We considered Alaska to be *somewhat grounded in history* due to the role historical thinking plays in the content standards, but the lack of a clear reference to history content rendered the standards *content low*.

Five states have written standards that are *not grounded in history*. The standards in these states follow a general social studies model and do not emphasize content in history or historical thinking. As described in Table 4, we consider the standards in these states to be so history light that they are ahistorical. Given the information that was available to us when examining these standards, we cannot say with confidence that students will learn the content of history or ways in which to engage in historical thinking

if they are taught using these five states' standards. Wyoming's standards are in the process of revision and are, as of this writing, in draft form.T hey are open for review and comments until June 24, 2003. We categorized Wyoming's standards as *not grounded in history, content low*. Similar to many other states in this category, Wyoming draws upon the National Council for the Social Studies model, using the standard, "Time, Continuity, and Change" to represent history. Students are expected to "demonstrate an understanding of the people, events, problems, ideas, and cultures that were significant in the history of our community, state, nation, and world." There are four benchmarks established for 11th graders in Wyoming. One benchmark reads, "Students analyze current events to better understand the world in which they live." One of the three benchmarks for 8th graders asks students to "identify people, events, problems, conflicts, and ideas and explain their historical significance." Fourth graders are expected to, "describe the chronology of exploration, immigration, and settlement of Wyoming."

Discrepancies Between Content Standards for Teachers and Students: The Cases of Indiana and Illinois

To distinguish the discrepancies that exist within states, we return to the previous examples of Indiana and Illinois. Indiana's content standards for teachers are vague and do not specify content. By contrast, Illinois' standards for teachers identify specific content knowledge and performance indicators for teachers. The opposite is true when it comes to each state's history content standards for students.

Indiana's history content standards for students have been ranked among the top twelve nationally by the National Council for History Education. For elementary students in Indiana, the academic standards in social studies consist of five categories of standards: history, civics and government, geography, economics, and individuals,

society, and culture. At the high school level the standards are organized in terms of separate subjects or courses, and two separate documents exist for United States history and for world history and civilizations.

Indiana's standards for students fit into the *discipline-based, content high* category in our survey. First, Indiana meets both major criteria of having created standards that recognize and emphasize the discipline of history and promote historical thinking in students. Specific standards are devoted to history at the high school level, and in the elementary and middle school level history is consistently emphasized within the social studies standards. Indiana's standards also meet the criteria of being specific and substantial. For example, by third grade students are expected to "develop simple timelines of events in the local communities" (chronological thinking) and to "explain why and how the local community was established, and identify founders and early settlers" (historical knowledge).[2] By fourth grade the standards call for students to know specific historical content and to engage in historical thinking through chronological thinking, comprehension, analysis, interpretation, and research capabilities. For example, students are to "give examples of Indiana's increasing agricultural, industrial, and business development in the nineteenth century" while also "distinguish[ing] fact from opinion and fact from fiction in historical documents and other information resources."[3] Content knowledge and engagement in historical thinking increases according to an age-appropriate level of complexity.

The high school standards in United States history and world history and civilizations are organized chronologically. The United States history standards consist of nine categories of standards, eight of which pertain to periods in U.S. history with

Standard 9 pertaining to historical research. The world history and civilizations document is made up of eleven categories of standards. The first ten categories of standards are organized as periods in world history, and the 11th addresses historical research. Performance indicators are specified within each of the 11 categories. They demonstrate the discipline of history's connections to Indiana's other subject-specific academic standards in the social studies. For example, Indiana's World History Standard 10.3 requires students to:

> Compare the totalitarian ideologies, institutions, and leaders of the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany. Describe acts of oppression, including extermination by the Nazis and Soviet Communists against particular inhabitants within their countries, and acts of aggression against other countries during the 1930s by the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany. (Civics and Government; Individuals, Society, and Culture)[4]

The history standards also make frequent reference to primary sources, and examples are prevalent throughout the document to assist teachers and clarify the intent of the standards.

The Illinois Learning Standards consist of 30 Goals. Goals 14-18 pertain to the social sciences, and Goal 16 pertains to the teaching and learning of history. Within Goal 16, Illinois has established five standards. The general areas that the standards address apply to all grades, K-12, and the state has developed specifications across five grade clusters: early elementary, late elementary, middle/junior high, early high school, and late high school. The first standard, Standard A, requires students to "apply the skills of historical analysis and interpretation." The descriptions under this standard and the fact

that Goal 16 pertains specifically to history place Illinois in the *discipline-based* category. After that major categorization, however, the similarity between Illinois' and Indiana's standards ends.

Illinois places a framework of historical eras to be addressed in both U.S. and world history at the top of Goal 16. However, this periodization is Illinois' only attempt at an orderly chronological approach. Chronology is not readily apparent throughout the standards. While Standard A nudges students toward an engagement in historical thinking, Standards B through E are not content specific. Late elementary school students are asked to "describe how the European colonies in North America developed politically" and late high school students are expected to "describe how tensions in the modern world are affected by different political ideologies including democracy and totalitarianism." Such standards as these render Illinois' Goal 16 *discipline-based, content medium*. Content is at least mentioned and is not merely a list; but the standard lacks clarity, cogency, and depth.

The National Council for History Education judged the Illinois Standards to be deficient; subsequently, efforts were made to give the standards substance through performance descriptors. It must be noted that these performance descriptors provide specifications and examples of content knowledge that students in Illinois should have when studying history. In addition, the state has developed content specific classroom assessments that also assist teachers and students in meeting the more general standards outlined initially in Goal 16.

The categories we have developed for the purposes of this survey were not designed to be absolute, and it is not our intent to target specific states unkindly and make

them subject to criticism. It is necessary, however, to acknowledge states that have successfully created standards that promote content knowledge in history and historical thinking and also to recognize states that have made or still need to make improvements. We organized these categories based on the criteria described above and described in Tables 2-5 and Table 9 in order to initiate and facilitate discussions pertaining to content standards in history for teachers and for students. We hope that this brief summary and analysis will contribute to this dialogue. It is especially important to note the differences between the content standards for teachers in Indiana and Illinois and the content standards for students in Indiana and Illinois. We believe that the quality of the standards for the teachers verses that for the students is uneven in both states (strong content standards for students with weak standards for teachers in Indiana and acceptable standards for teachers and questionable standards for students in Illinois). We will return to these two states as we continue to examine other areas of this survey.

Closely related to the standards movement in the United States is a concern with assessment. We now turn to an examination of assessments in history, the social sciences, and social studies in each of the fifty states and Washington, D.C. to better understand the extent to which states link their standards with criterion-referenced assessments.

Notes, Section 4

---

[1] National Center for History in the Schools, *National Standards for History*, Basic Edition (Los Angeles: National Center for History in the Schools, 1996).
[2] Indiana Academic Standards, *Indiana Department of Education*, 2001 – Grade 3 Standards, 31.
[3] Indiana Academic Standards, *Indiana Department of Education*, 2001 – Grade 4 Standards, 36.
[4] Indiana Academic Standards, *Indiana Department of Education*, 2001 – World History and Civilization, 12.

5. FINDINGS ABOUT GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS AND ASSSESSMENTS

Assessment has played a role in history education since at least the early twentieth century. In the past twenty years public concern about assessment has increased, and "high stakes tests" have become a common part of the grammar of schooling in many states. This section of our report examines high school graduation requirements and assessments that are required in history.

Graduation Requirements and Exit Examinations

High schools in the United States use such terms as credits or units when referring to the requirements students must meet for graduation. For the purposes of this study, we examined the credits or units students are required to pass in United States history and in world history in order to earn a high school diploma. See Table 1 in Appendix A for this information.

States develop policies regarding graduation requirements, and the policy of some states is to rely on local control. Therefore, it is often difficult to place the detailed descriptions of states' policies in a larger coherent picture of history education nationwide. In short, we know that 30 states and the District of Columbia require students to take United States history in order to graduate from high school. Only twelve states and the District of Columbia require students to take world history to qualify for graduation. Eight states insist that students take exit or end-of-course (EOC) examinations in history or social studies, and five states currently tie exit or end-of-course examinations to a student's diploma. A more detailed description and breakdown of the data follows.

Thirty states and Washington, D.C. have designated specific requirements regarding the study of history at the high school level. The District of Columbia and all 30 of the states that have developed specifications in history necessary for graduation require students to take United States history in order to graduate from high school. The credits or units necessary range from ½ to 2 credits, depending on the state (see Table 1). Of these 30 states, Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, New York, Oklahoma, and Virginia have end-of-course examinations in place. Idaho, Indiana, Maryland, Ohio, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas either are in the process of creating exit examinations or have them scheduled to begin in the near future. Louisiana is unique in that it requires students to take an examination in either social studies or science, but not in both subjects. Information pertaining to an exit exam has not been located in three states (South Dakota, Utah, and West Virginia) and Washington, D.C., even though we know that they require students to achieve a unit/credit in United States history. The remaining states in this category do not require successful completion of an exit examination, and there is no indication that they intend to do so.

Only twelve states and the District of Columbia require students to earn credit in world history in order to graduate from high school. These states include: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Florida, Kansas, Maryland, Mississippi, Utah (½ credit required), Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia. The state of Washington is included in this category, but it must be noted that the world history requirement is designated as "contemporary world history, geography, and problems."

Of the 30 states that specify unit/credit requirements in history for high school graduation, 18 states do not require that students take any world history. Identifying

states in which world history is required can be complex because certain states require world history for some students and not for others. For example, in Louisiana students are required to take one unit of world history *or* world geography *or* western civilization. The option to take world history exists, but it is not mandated. A similar situation exists in Tennessee. Georgia, Indiana, North Carolina, and Texas have outlined similar policies. In each of these states, the world history requirement coincides with the type of diploma a student earns. World history is often a requirement only for "upper track" or "honors" students. For example, in Georgia, students who are on a college prep track must take one unit of world history, while students enrolled in a technical/career prep track can elect to take one unit of world studies/geography. In Indiana, world "studies" is not even required for a general high school diploma.

Ten other states require students to earn credits or units in social studies, but we have not been able to determine the amount of actual history that students must take under this general social studies credit. For example, in Connecticut, students must take 3 social studies credits in order to earn a diploma, but we do not know if these credits have to be in United States history or world history. Of the ten states in this category, three states require or are in the process of developing end-of-course assessments that are tied to students' ability to earn a diploma. New Mexico already compels students to take an assessment in social studies, and passing the examination is a graduation requirement. Wisconsin has delayed implementing such an examination until 2006. By 2006, students in Delaware will also be taking an assessment. Their scores in social studies will be scaled and count for 20% of an index score. The total index score that a student earns will

be used to determine the type of diploma a student graduating from a Delaware high school will receive.

Seven states have not developed graduation requirements. These states (Colorado, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island) may set guidelines or make recommendations, but local school districts set the policies and make the final decisions. Of these seven states, five do not compel students to pass an exit or end-of-course examination. Massachusetts and New Jersey are the only states in this group that are in the process of developing an EOC test in history. In Massachusetts, the state is scheduled to pilot the examination during the 2004-2005 school year. The state has not specified if a student's score on the assessment has any effect on the earning of a diploma. By the 2004-2005 school year students in New Jersey will have to pass an exit examination in social studies for graduation purposes.

There are four states for which we have no comprehensive information regarding graduation requirements at this point. These states include Maine, Michigan, Montana, and North Dakota. It should be noted that Maine explained that it is in the process of moving from credits to a standard-based system of graduation requirements. While we do not have information on Michigan's graduation requirements, we do know that Michigan considers its 11th grade MEAP (Michigan Educational Assessment Program) assessment to be an exit exam, but it is not required for graduation purposes. Such examinations as the MEAP also serve as part of the statewide assessment system that states have developed, and it is to that system that we now turn.

Assessments in History, the Social Sciences, and Social Studies

The 2001 No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) reaffirmed a growing trend in the United States – an increasing focus on assessment. NCLB stipulated that schools had to begin administering tests in each of three grade spans, 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12, during the 2002-2003 school year. By 2005-2006, tests must be administered every year in grades 3-8 in mathematics and reading. Science must be included in the testing schedule by the 2007-2008 school year. Testing in other subjects, including history, the social sciences, and social studies, has been left to the discretion of the states.

Two major categories of tests are administered in the United States: norm-referenced tests and criterion-referenced tests. Norm-referenced tests are designed to enable evaluators to compare individuals' scores to the scores of a group. A sample, or norm group is used to develop descriptive statistics or norms that summarize the group's test performance. Individual students' scores are then compared to the group's scores. Examples of norm-referenced tests that are being used currently by some states include the Stanford Achievement Test (Ninth Edition) and Terra Nova (The Second Edition).

Criterion-referenced tests specify a particular objective or criterion that students are to achieve. Students' scores are based on the extent to which they achieve that objective. Our interest in this study focused on the extent to which states have developed criterion-referenced tests based on their history standards. Tables 6, 7, and 8 depict standards-based assessment in history in the United States.

According to state departments of education and literature published by the states, sixteen states currently administer some form of criterion-referenced tests to their students. The label given to the content focus of the test varies by state. For example,

California administers a "history-social science" test. Delaware specifies that students are tested in civics, economics, geography, and history, and Georgia requires students to take a "social studies" test. As is indicated in Table 6, only Georgia and Virginia begin testing in third grade. Five states begin testing students in grade four, four states first administer tests in grade five, and two states wait until the sixth grade. California and Texas first test students in grade eight, and North Carolina waits until the eleventh grade. Georgia does not test students in social studies after the eighth grade.

Twelve states are currently in the process of developing standards-based assessment for their students. Three of these states have suspended testing due to financial constraints. Indiana scheduled a pilot social studies test to be administered in 2004, but it has been pushed back at least a year. In Missouri a social studies criterion-referenced test exists, but the state is not currently funding its administration. And in New Jersey a civics, history, and geography test exists, but it is not included on the test assessment schedule posted by the state.

Twenty-two states and Washington, D.C. do not currently have standards-based assessment in history, the social sciences, or social studies. Minnesota represents a slight exception. Social studies is not part of the Minnesota Statewide Assessment System; but according to the state social studies specialist, Minnesota statutes require that "at the high school level districts shall assess student performance in all required learning areas and selected required standards within each area of the profile of learning."

If assessment equals importance, history suffers in our nation's schools. The No Child Left Behind Act does not require states to administer tests in history, and as this survey suggests, states strapped for funds might cut assessments that are not federally

mandated. Three states have done so. Students' ability to learn and truly understand history could very well be undermined by the assessment system as it currently exists. With only sixteen states engaged in standards-based assessment in history, the social sciences, or social studies, a concern must be raised: If subjects are not tested, will they be taught? United States history as a subject for study in high schools is not in any real danger of being eliminated from the school curriculum, as the data pertaining to graduation requirements indicates. The place of world history, however, is not as secure.

History is not tested in 25 states (including the three in which exams are suspended), and there is no plan to develop assessments in 22 states and in Washington, D.C. Given our nation's current interest in high stakes testing it has become entirely possible that classroom time will be allocated to those content areas on which students will be tested. Elementary and middle school students who are not formally assessed in history might not receive adequate preparation in the subject. High school graduation requirements, exit examinations, and assessments cannot make up for a primary school education that does not enable students to develop basic historical understanding. Assessment will undoubtedly continue to hold an important place in future discussions pertaining to history education.

6. RESOURCES AND ORGANIZATIONS FOR TEACHERS

The final, online report also includes information pertaining to the resources that are available for teachers in each state and the organizations related to history, the social sciences, and social studies that are available for teachers to join. When possible, information pertaining to the following resources and organizations has been included in the online report.

- State Council for History Education
- State Council for Social Studies
- State Council for Economics Education
- State Council for/Geographic Alliance
- Listing of any Holocaust Museums
- Listing of Museums Pertaining to African-American History
- General Web Page
- State Historical Society
- State Archives
- State Library
- "History Day" for the State

See the online report at the OAH website for detailed information relevant to each state and the District of Columbia.

7. CONCLUDING COMMENTS ABOUT HISTORY EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

In this study, we provide an overview of the state of history education as it exists currently in the United States. The purpose is not to "rate" or "grade" the states with respect to their certification policies, standards, assessments, graduation requirements, and resources and organizations for teacher membership. Rather, we organize the data in a comprehensible form to foster reflection and discussion. While we do not wish to pinpoint specific states for criticism or praise, we believe it is helpful to use one state, Indiana, as an example of strong points and of areas that could be improved with regard to history education.

Indiana's state profile appears in Appendix B in this document. As has been noted in preceding sections, Indiana's student standards have received national recognition for their high quality in content and in historical thinking. Indiana is also moving toward standards-based assessment for its 5th, 7th, and 9th graders, although this assessment has been suspended for at least a year due to monetary constraints. While Indiana is strong in its history standards for students and is working to improve its assessments, weak areas exist.

The certification requirements for Indiana teachers are shockingly low given the content knowledge a teacher needs to teach the standards effectively. As licensure exists currently in the state, teachers at the high school level must complete coursework under "historical perspectives" to be certified to teach history. The actual amount of history courses required under this concentration remains unknown. Middle school teachers can receive broad social studies certification in each of the six areas of concentration that

make up the social studies by only actually concentrating on one area. Therefore, middle school teachers in Indiana can teach courses on United States history and world history without having received adequate preparation in content knowledge. The standards for teachers do not alleviate this difficult situation. Indiana's standards for teachers in the social studies lack rigor and specificity.

Indiana faces a situation in which it is placing high demands and expectations on its students without adequately preparing teachers to assist students in meeting these challenges. We cannot blame teachers for their inadequate preparation when they are merely following the policies established by governing bodies in the state. We must fault the state government. Suggestions and recommendations that teachers should major in a content area are not enough. States must establish stringent requirements for teachers, and they must develop content rich standards for teachers as well as for students if we are to truly leave no child behind.

The No Child Left Behind Act requires states to ensure that all teachers are "highly qualified" by the 2005-2006 school year. And to be considered "highly qualified" a teacher must complete a major in an academic discipline. A major in history will prepare teachers to teach the subject. A broad field major in social studies will yield only more of the same problems we face today.

Improved certification requirements with respect to content knowledge are not enough. We know that knowledge of a subject area does not necessarily make one a good teacher. However, ensuring a teacher has content knowledge in the subject he teachers is, at the minimum, a positive step. We also need standards for teachers that are as specific and content rich as (using Indiana as an example) the content standards for students. It

makes little sense to establish strong standards for students and weak standards for teachers. The reverse is also nonsensical. We know that teachers and students work together in the learning process, and each group's respective standards must work in concert with those of the other group.

Problems also abound in Indiana in regard to assessment and graduation requirements. It is positive that the state planned to assess 5th grade students in social studies by 2004, but the state's good intentions have come to no avail. The No Child Left Behind Act does not compel states to test students in history, the social sciences, or social studies. Many states, therefore, will not do so. Due to the stipulations of NCLB, many states will undoubtedly develop assessments first in mathematics and reading. Then they will turn to science. It would be foolish of the states not to prioritize in this way given the federal regulations. But where does that leave history? Can we rely on states to do what is "right" and essentially demand that history be taught by creating an assessment?

Graduation requirements represent another area of disappointment in history education. While United States history retains a prominent place in the curriculum, world history suffers tremendously. It is extremely disturbing that in Indiana, graduation requirements in world history, if they are issued, only include "upper track" students. Should students who are not planning to attend college miss the opportunity to understand their place in space and time in the context of world civilizations?

As is evident from the information gathered in this survey, states that are strong in specific areas of history education do not necessarily demonstrate strength across the board. While we see positive movements in regard to history education in many states, there is significant room for improvement.

The time to improve history education is now. Concern with history education has reached a highpoint in recent times, and we must take advantage of the public's interest and recognition of the importance of history. In 1913, the editors of *The History Teacher's Magazine* urged history teachers to "be prepared to justify their subject, both in content and method if it is to be retained in our school curricula." The editors (who were members of the American Historical Association) proclaimed, "We are living in times when the historians must set their own house in order if they do not wish it to be remodeled without their consent by outsiders."[1] Some would argue that historians and history teachers failed in this endeavor in 1913. We must ensure that we do not fail in 2003.

The information gathered in this survey is intended to promote deliberative discussions about the state of precollegiate history education and to encourage historians, history teachers, school administrators, and policymakers to work collaboratively to improve the teaching and learning of history nationwide. The information we have reported is not altogether positive. Yet, we remain optimistic that strong content standards, standards-based assessments, and improved licensure requirements will assist Americans in enhancing history education and elevating student achievement.

Notes, Section 7

---

[1] "All of History or Only Topics?" *The History Teacher's Magazine* 4, no. 4 (1913): 103.

APPENDIX A: TABLES

Table 1

High School Graduation Requirements and Exit Exam as Defined by the States

	US History	World History	Exit Exam/EOC	Relation to Diploma*
Alabama	2 Credits (US History & Geography)	1 Credit (World History & Geography)	Yes	Required
Alaska	3 Credits Social Studies (Not Specified)		No	None
Arizona	1.5 Credits (US History & AZ Consitutions)	1 Credit (World History & Geography)	No	None
Arkansas	1 Unit	1 Unit	No	None
California	1 Course (US History & Geography)	1 Course (World History, Culture & Geography)	No (Golden State Exam Linked to Diploma)	Score of 4 in US History Required for Merit Diploma
Colorado	Local Decision	Local Decision	No	None
Connecticut	3 Social Studies (Not Specified)		No	None
Delaware	3 Social Studies (Not Specified)		Scores indexed in 2006	Scale score in social studies counts for 20% of an index - total index score determines diploma received
Florida	1 Credit	1 Credit	No	None
Georgia	1 Unit	College prep. - 1 unit; Technical/Career prep. - 1 unit world studies/geography	Yes	Required
Hawaii	4 Social Studies (Not Specified)		No	None
Idaho	2 Semester Credits	Not Required	In Progress	None
Illinois	1 Year	Not Required	No	None
Indiana	2 Credits	Not required for "High School" Diploma; For "Core 40" or "Academic Honors" Diplomas: 1 Credit World History and Civilization and/or World Geography	US history pilot schedued Spring 2005	3 types of diplomas available based on courses taken
Iowa	1 Unit	Not Required	No	None
Kansas	3 Units (US History, World History, Government)		No	None

* Indicates extent to which exit exam has an impact on whether or not a student receives a diploma or the type of diploma the student receives

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1 (Continued)

High School Graduation Requirements and Exit Exam as Defined by the States (cont'd)				
	US History	**World History**	**Exit Exam/EOC**	**Relation to Diploma***
Kentucky	3 Credits (US History, Economics, Government, World Geography, World Civilization)		No	None
Louisiana	1 Unit	1 Unit (World History or World Geography or Western Civilization)	Social Studies OR Science	Social Studies OR Science (therefore not required)
Maine	Moving from credits to standards-based graduation requirements		Unknown	Unknown
Maryland	1 Credit	1 Credit	Planned	Not Specified
Massachusetts	No Statewide Requirements: Most Districts Require 3 Years of Social Studies		Scheduled to Pilot in 2004-2005	Not Specified
Michigan	Unknown	Unknown	11th Grade MEAP is Considered Exit Exam: Passing is Not a Graduation Requirement	
Minnesota	Students' Records Must Reflect Achievement in Number of Standards Required by District		No	None
Mississippi	1 Unit	1 Unit	Yes	Required
Missouri	1 Unit	Not Required	Local Tests	Not Specified
Montana	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Nebraska	Local Decision	Local Decision	No	None
Nevada	1 Unit	Not Required	No	None
New Hampshire	1 Unit	Not Required	No	None
New Jersey	Local Decision	Local Decision	Implemented by 2004-2005	Required 2004-2005
New Mexico	3 Units in Social Science (guideline only)		Yes	Required
New York	1 Unit	Not Required	Yes	Must pass Regents Exam (Global History and Geography and US History and Government) to Receive Regents Diploma or Advanced Regents Diploma

* Indicates extent to which exit exam has an impact on whether or not a student receives a diploma or the type of diploma the student receives

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1 (Continued)

High School Graduation Requirements and Exit Exam as Defined by the States (cont'd)				
	US History	**World History**	**Exit Exam/EOC**	**Relation to Diploma***
North Carolina	1 Unit	1 Unit World Studies or None (Occupational Designation)	On Hold Indefinitely	On Hold Indefinitely
North Dakota	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Ohio	0.5 Units	Not Required	2005	Required 2005
Oklahoma	1 credit	Not Required	Yes	Unknown
Oregon	3 Social Studies, Not Specified		No	None
Pennsylvania	School Districts Determine		No	None
Rhode Island	State Sets Guidelines, Local Agencies Set Requirements		No	None
South Carolina	1 Unit (and Constitution)	Not Required	In Progress	In Progress
South Dakota	1 Unit	Not Required	Unknown	Unknown
Tennessee	1 Unit 1 Credit	1 Unit (World History or World Geography) 1 Credit	EOC in Progress	Not Tied to Graduation
Texas	(Since Reconstruction)	(World History Studies - Minimum Plan Allows for World History Studies OR World Geography Studies)	EOC for Students Graduating in 2005 or Later Requires Social Studies	Required 2005
Utah (revising)	1 Credit	1/2 Credit (World Civilizations)	Unknown	Unknown
Vermont	3 Years Required or Demonstration of Attaining or Exceeding State Standards or Combination of Both		No	None
Virginia	Standard and Advanced Diplomas: 1 Credit (VA and US)	Standard Diploma: 1 Credit (World History and Geography) Advanced Diploma: 2 Credits (World History and Geography)	Yes	Standard Diploma: 1 Verified Unit of Credit; Advanced Diploma: 2 Verified Units of Credit

* Indicates extent to which exit exam has an impact on whether or not a student receives a diploma or the type of diploma the student receives

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1 (Continued)

High School Graduation Requirements and Exit Exam as Defined by the States (cont'd)				
	US History	**World History**	**Exit Exam/EOC**	**Relation to Diploma***
Washington	1 Credit (US History & Government)	1 Credit (Contemporary World History, Geography, and Problems)	Set by Districts	Set by Districts
West Virginia	2 Units (US and World, 1500-1900 & US and World, 20th Century)	1 Unit (To 1500)	Unknown	Unknown
Wisconsin	3 Social Studies (Not Specified)		Delayed Until 2006	Delayed Until 2006
Wyoming	3 years required, including American history, government, and economic systems		No	None
Washington, DC	1 Unit	1 Unit	Unknown	Unknown

* Indicates extent to which exit exam has an impact on whether or not a student receives a diploma or the type of diploma the student receives

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

Discipline-Based		
Content High	Alabama Arizona California Indiana Kansas Maryland * Massachusetts Nevada ** New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York Texas Virginia	► "History Heavy" ► Separate disciplines exist; can be connected to other disciplines, but recognizable as disciplines ► Historical thinking promoted and plays a key role ► Periodization identified clearly in the standards ► Substantial and specific content examples N=14
Content Medium	Colorado Connecticut Delaware Florida Idaho Illinois Louisiana Maine Michigan Oregon *** Pennsylvania South Carolina West Virginia Wisconsin	► Separate disciplines exist; can be connected to other disciplines, but recognizable as disciplines ► Historical thinking promoted and plays a key role ► Periodization identified, but perhaps as an overview; not imbedded in standards ► Content examples vague; references to students' knowledge of "major events," but few specifications provided ► Content at times disjointed; not highly specific, not highly substantial N=14
Content Low	Hawaii Vermont Washington Washington, DC	► Separate disciplines exist; can be connected to other disciplines, but recognizable as disciplines ► Historical thinking promoted and plays a key role ► Content mentioned but not connected to any standards ► Content consists of list; list is often trivial ► Abstract statements, few precise examples N=4

Total Number = 32

* States fall into the same category K-3 and 4-12 unless indicated. Maryland's 4-12 standards are discipline-based, content high, while their K-3 standards are discipline-based, content low.

** Nevada's 4-12 standards are discipline-based, content high, while their K-3 standards are discipline-based, content medium.

*** Oregon's 4-12 standards are discipline-based, content medium,wh ile their K-3 standards are discipline-based, content low.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3

Somewhat History-Based		
Content Medium	Nebraska North Carolina * Oklahoma ** South Dakota *** Tennessee Utah ****	► "History Medium" ► Emphasis on history content OR historical thinking but not both ► "Skills" prevalent rather than historical thinking ► Content examples vague; references to students' knowledge of "major events," but few specifications provided ► Content at times disjointed; not highly specific, not highly substantial N=6
Content Low	Alaska Kentucky Minnesota Montana North Dakota Ohio	► Emphasis on history content OR historical thinking but not both ► "Skills" prevalent rather than historical thinking ► Content mentioned but not connected to any standards ► Content consists of list; list is often trivial ► Abstract statements, few precise examples N=6

* States fall into the same category K-3 and 4-12 unless indicated. North Carolina's standards are considered somewhat grounded in history, content medium at the high school (9-12) level,b ut they are not grounded in history, content low for K-3 and 4-8.
** Oklahoma's 4-12 standards are somewhat historical, content medium, while their K-3 standards are not grounded in history, content low.
*** South Dakota's 4-12 standards are somewhat historical, content medium, while their K-3 standards are somewhat historical, content high.
**** Utah's 4-12 standards are somewhat historical, content medium, while their K-3 standards are not grounded in history, content low.

Table 4

Not Grounded in History		
	Arkansas Georgia Mississippi Missouri Wyoming	► "History Light" or "Ahistorical" ► Discipline of history does not play a predominant role ► Content mentioned but not connected to any standards ► Content consists of list; list is often trivial ► Abstract statements, few precise examples N=5

Table 5

No Standards		
No Standards	Iowa Rhode Island	► As a matter of policy, states have not adopted standards N=2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 6

Standards-Based Assessment Exists *		
	Grade Level	**Content Focus**
California **	8, 10, 11	history-social science
Delaware	4, 6, 8, 11	civics, economics, geography, history
Georgia	3-8	social studies
Illinois	4, 7, 11	social science
Kansas	6, 8, 11	social studies
Kentucky	5, 8, 11	social studies
Louisiana	4, 8, 11	geography, civics, economics, history
Maine	4, 8, 11	social studies
Michigan	5, 8, 11	social studies
New Hampshire	6, 10	social studies
New York	5, 8, commencement	5 & 8: social studies; high school: global history and geography and US history and government
North Carolina ***	11	end-of-course: US history
Oklahoma	5, 8, end-of-instruction	5: US history and government from 1492 to 1800; 8 US history and government from 1760 to 1860; end-of-instruction: 1850 to 1975
Texas	8, 10, 11	history, geography, economic and social influences, political influences, social studies skills
Virginia	3, 5, 8, end-of-course	history
Wisconsin	4, 8, 10	social studies

Total Number = 16

* Based on declaration of state department of education and state literature, assessment is CRT/standards-based.
** Revising for 2003 school year.
*** Moving toward portfolios requiring students to demonstrate proficiency in communication, using numbers and data, problem solving, processing information, teamwork, and using technology.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 7

Standards-Based Assessment in Development *			
	Grade Level	**Content Focus**	**Notes**
Alabama	6, 10, 11	social studies	6th grade to begin 2007-2008
Idaho	not specified	social studies	districts can use a state test or develop their own
Indiana	5, 7, 9	social studies	5th grade pilot scheduled for 2004, suspended
Massachusetts	5, 7, 10 or 11	5: US history and geography through the War of 1812; 7:World geography and the history of ancient and classical civilizations;1 0/11: US history	pilot scheduled for 2004-2005
Missouri	4, 8, 11	social studies	test exists but state is not currently funding its administration
New Jersey	5, 8, 11	civics, history (including economics), and geography	social studies not included on the current assessment schedule
New Mexico	not specified	not specified	under development
Ohio**	5, 8	social studies	scheduled for 2006
Oregon	5, 8, 10	social studies	pilot scheduled for spring 2003; work samples scheduled to be collected from students in social science by 2005-2006
South Carolina	not specified	social studies, US history	scheduled to become operational in 2003; end-of-course scheduled for baseline implementation in 2006-2007
Tennessee	3-8	social studies	CRT added to exams by 2003-2004; end-of-course US history postponed
Washington	not specified	not specified	pilots being developed

Total Number = 12

* Based on declaration of state department of education and state literature, assessment is CRT/standards-based.
** Students in Ohio currently take a proficiency test in citizenship in grades 4 and 6.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 8

No Standards-Based Assessment Exists *		
Alaska	Maryland	Rhode Island
Arizona	Minnesota **	South Dakota
Arkansas	Mississippi	Utah
Colorado	Montana	Vermont
Connecticut	Nebraska	West Virginia
Florida	Nevada	Wyoming
Hawaii	North Dakota	Washington, DC
Iowa	Pennsylvania	

Total Number = 23

* Based on declaration of state department of education and state literature, assessment is CRT/standards-based.
** Required at district level, not by the state.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 9

	Certification (Course Credit Hours/Proficiencies) *			Teacher Standards	
	Elementary	Middle	High School	Yes	No
Alabama	UB	UB	UB	YH	
Alaska	UB	MN - 18 hrs history	MN - 18 hrs history		N
Arizona	UB, CT	X	UB, CT		N
Arkansas	6 hrs history, PX	3 hrs history, PX	"social studies" (none), PX	Y	
California	UB, CT	UB, CT	UB, CT	YH	
Colorado	UB	UB	UB		N
Connecticut	3 hrs US	15 hrs history	18 hrs history	Y	
Delaware (revising)	UB	UB	6 hrs history		N
Florida	UB	6 hrs US, credit Wrld	6 hrs US, 2 courses Wrld		N
Georgia	UB, PX	15 hrs (NCSS), PX	MJ (NCSS), PX		NCATE
Hawaii	UB, PX	UB, PX	UB, PX		N
Idaho	12 hrs social science (one US)	6 hrs US	6 hrs US	YH - only US	
Illinois	UB, CT	9 hrs in "area" (endorsement)	16 hrs history	YH	
Indiana	courses in US, Wrld Civ, CT	1 area of concentration, CT	"historical perspectives," CT	YH	
Iowa	UB (18 hrs endorsement)	6 hrs US, Wrld, Geog	9 hrs US, 9 hrs Wrld		N
Kansas	"study of subject areas"	UB	UB	YH	
Kentucky	UB, PX	UB, PX	UB, PX		N
Louisiana	12 hrs social studies	X	12 hrs history		N
Maine (revising)	6 hrs social science	18 hrs social studies	MJ social science		N
Maryland	9 hrs social studies	X	2 history courses		NCATE
Massachusetts	courses in history, CT	CT	CT		YH, CERT
Michigan	CT	24 hrs social studies	24 hrs social studies	YH	
Minnesota	UB	UB, social studies standards	UB, social studies standards		CERT
Mississippi	12 hrs social studies, CT	12 hrs social studies, CT	MJ social studies, CT		CERT
Missouri	US course, PX	21 hrs social studies, PX	20 hrs history, PX, portfolio		NCATE

* Information represents minimum requirements allowed by the state.

Certification and Standards Key

UB = University-Based Requirements
PF = Proficiency
PX = Praxis
MJ = Major
MN = Minor
CT = Content Test
Y/N = Content standards do/do not exist as indicated in column
YH = Content standards specific to history exist
CERT = States refer to their certification requirements as content standards
NCATE = States refer to NCATE standards as content standards
X = Not Specified
US = United States History
Wrld = World History

64 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 9 (Continued)

	Certification (Course Credit Hours/Proficiencies) *			Teacher Standards	
	Elementary	Middle	High School	Yes	No
Montana	UB	X	10 credits		N
Nebraska	UB	60 hrs social science	60 hrs social science	NOT LOCATED	
Nevada	UB	16 hrs history and polsci	16 hrs history and polsci		CERT
New Hampshire	X	PF	PF		YH, CERT
New Jersey	UB, PX	30 hrs coherent MJ, PX	30 hrs coherent MJ, PX	IN PROCESS	
New Mexico	12 hrs history, CT	24 hrs social studies, CT	24 hrs social studies, CT	YH	
New York	6 hrs social studies	36 hours social studies	36 hours social studies		YH, CERT
North Carolina	PF	PF	PF		CERT
North Dakota	X	X	6 hrs US, 6 hrs Wrld	YH	
Ohio	X, CT	UB, CT	UB, CT		NCATE
Oklahoma	12 hrs social studies	X	MJ social studies		NCATE
Oregon	CT	PX, CT	PX		N
Pennsylvania	appropriate courses, PX	X	content related to standards, PX		CERT
Rhode Island	UB	21 hrs social studies (must include history)	24 hrs history		N
South Carolina	UB, CT	UB, CT	UB, CT		NCATE
South Dakota	2 hrs US	12 hrs social studies	12 hrs in one content area		CERT
Tennessee	UB	UB	UB		NCATE
Texas	12 hrs elem combination, CT	X	6 hrs history, CT	YH	
Utah	UB	X	16 hrs history		NCATE
Vermont	PF	PF	PF	YH	
Virginia	9 hrs history, CT	21 hrs in 2 areas, CT	18 hrs history, CT		YH, CERT
Washington	appropriate courses	6 hrs social studies	16 hrs history		CERT
West Virginia	UB, CT	UB, CT	UB, CT		NCATE
Wisconsin	PF (2004)	PF (2004)	PF (2004)	IN PROCESS	
Wyoming	PF	PF	PF		YH, CERT
Washington, DC	PX, reciprocity	PX, reciprocity	PX, reciprocity	NOT LOCATED	

* Information represents minimum requirements allowed by the state.

Certification and Standards Key

UB = University-Based Requirements
PF = Proficiency
PX = Praxis
MJ = Major
MN = Minor
CT = Content Test
Y/N = Content standards do/do not exist as indicated in column
YH = Content standards specific to history exist
CERT = States refer to their certification requirements as content standards
NCATE = States refer to NCATE standards as content standard
X = Not Specified
US = United States History
Wrld = World History

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 10

University-Based (UB) Certification Requirements		
Alabama	Hawaii	South Carolina
Arizona	Kansas	Tennessee
California	Kentucky	West Virginia
Colorado	Ohio	N=11
Demonstration of Proficiency (PF) Required		
New Hampshire	Vermont	Wyoming
North Carolina	Wisconsin	N=5
Only Testing Required (CT or PX)		
Massachusetts	Pennsylvania	Washington, DC
Oregon	Minnesota	N=5

Table 11

State Specified Hours Required in History *			
30+ hrs	15-29 hrs	0-14 hrs	
	Alaska	Arkansas	Montana
	Connecticut	Delaware	Nebraska
	Illinois	Florida	Nevada
	Iowa	Georgia	New Jersey
	Missouri	Idaho	New Mexico
	Rhode Island	Indiana	New York
	Utah	Louisiana	North Dakota
	Virginia	Maine	Oklahoma
	Washington	Maryland	South Dakota
		Michigan	Texas
		Mississippi	
	Low: 16 hrs High: 24 hrs	Low: 0 hrs High: 12 hrs	
N=0	N=9	N=21	

* Categorization reflects requirements for the high school level. At the middle school level, only Alaska and Connecticut remain in the 15-29 hrs category.T he other states drop to 0-14 hrs required for certification. Most states do not specify hours in history required for elementary certification.

Table 12

States That Have Yet to Respond to the Survey		
Arizona	Montana	Washington
Iowa	Oklahoma	West Virginia
Mississippi	Utah	Washington, DC

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B: SAMPLE STATE PROFILE, INDIANA

INDIANA

CERTIFICATION

The Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB) establishes standards and issues licenses in Indiana. Candidates first are granted a Standard license, and after successful completion of further requirements they can apply for a Professional license. The IPSB has established the following minimum requirements to become a Standard-licensed teacher in Indiana:

- completion of an approved teacher preparation program at a state or regionally accredited institution, including student teaching.
- a bachelor's degree at a state or regionally accredited institution.
- passing scores on the applicable teacher exams; and
- completion of recency credit – a minimum of six semester hours of college course work in education or the major or minor area of the license completed within the past five years.

Elementary Certification

A Standard license in elementary education requires the completion of an undergraduate program consisting of a minimum of 124 semester hours. 70 hours must occur in general education and subject matter preparation, 30 hours in professional preparation, and 24 hours in electives. No specific hour requirements in social studies are listed under the 70 hours of subject matter preparation. The section on social studies states:

> This area shall be designed to develop understanding of contemporary civilization, economics and government, current social problems and modern family life and shall always include a course in U.S. history and a course in world civilization. An integrative approach shall be used whenever possible.

Junior High/Middle School Endorsement

Holders of a Standard or Professional license in elementary education qualify for a junior high/middle school endorsement after the completion of 24 hours of coursework.

Junior High/Middle School License

A Standard license in junior high/middle school education requires the completion of an undergraduate program consisting of a minimum of 124 semester hours. 40 hours must be in general education. The content standards for teachers in Indiana provide the basis for the areas of concentration in which teachers are licensed. They encompass nine strands: civic ideals, current events, economics, geographical perspectives, historical perspectives, government and citizenship, psychology, sociology, and world cultures. There are six areas that exist as content standards at the junior high/middle school level in social studies: economics, geographical perspectives, government and citizenship, historical perspectives, psychology, and sociology. Candidates for a social studies license must complete preparation in each of these areas, but concentration must occur only in one area. The teacher will be licensed to teach all six areas.

Secondary Education License

A Standard license in secondary education requires the completion of 124 hours. 40 hours are in general education. The content standards for teachers in Indiana provide the basis for the areas of concentration in which teachers are licensed. They encompass nine

strands: civic ideals, current events, economics, geographical perspectives, historical perspectives, government and citizenship, psychology, sociology, and world cultures. There are six areas at the high school level in social studies: economics, geographical perspectives, government and citizenship, historical perspectives, psychology, and sociology. Candidates for a social studies license must complete preparation in each of the nine strands within the six standards. Concentration must occur in three of these areas. The teacher will be licensed in these three areas. The number of hours required for licensure in historical perspectives is unknown.

STANDARDS

Standards for Teachers

The Indiana Professional Standards Board developed performance-based standards for teacher preparation and licensure. This process first began in 1994. Content and developmental standards for teachers exist in Indiana, and the standards have been aligned with national professional education organizations (NCATE, INTASC, NBPTS), specialty groups, and the Indiana Department of Education K-12 proficiencies.

Content standards for teachers in social studies were approved on March 19, 1998. There are 9 standards and 4 teaching tasks/standards for social studies. Each standard designates performances, knowledge, and dispositions required of a social studies teacher in Indiana. The 9 standards and 4 teaching tasks include:

Standard 1: Civic Ideals and Practices
Standard 2: Historical Perspectives
Standard 3: Geographical Perspectives
Standard 4: Government and Citizenship
Standard 5: Economics
Standard 6: Current Events
Standard 7: Psychology
Standard 8: Sociology
Standard 9: World Cultures
Standard 10: Instructional Resources/Technology (teaching task)
Standard 11: Learning Environment (teaching task)
Standard 12: Assessment (teaching task)
Standard 13: Reflection (teaching task)

In Standard 2, Historical Perspectives, teachers of social studies "understand the way human beings view themselves in and over time and can use this knowledge to create meaningful learning experiences for students." The performances, knowledge, and dispositions in this standard emphasize historical inquiry, chronology, facts and concepts, and interpretation. This standard focuses on both U.S. and world history, as Standard 9, World Cultures, emphasizes culture and cultural diversity and is not historical in its performances, knowledge, or dispositions.

Standards for Students

Academic standards in social studies for students were approved by the State Board of Education in August 2001. According to the National Council for History Education, the Indiana Academic Standards for the Social Studies are "among the top dozen of all the state standards in social studies, history and the social sciences." NCHE

reviewers praised Indiana's clarity in its standards and its emphasis on "substantive narrative content." The standards are organized by grade level for grades K-8 and separated into five content areas (history; civics and government; geography; economics; and individuals, society, and culture [psychology, sociology, and anthropology]). At the high school level the standards are organized to coincide with courses, and separate standards have been developed for United States History and World History and Civilization.

For elementary students, age appropriate concepts and historical thinking are listed under each standard and examples are provided. For example, in kindergarten and first grade students are expected to obtain historical knowledge and develop chronological thinking. In second grade students add comprehension to their skills. Grades three, four, five, and six incorporate analysis, interpretation, and research capabilities, while grades seven and eight introduce issues-analysis, decision-making, planning, and problem solving. Between kindergarten and third grade students study their rights and responsibilities as citizens in their community and learn to examine differences between the past and the present. In fourth grade students learn state history, and in fifth grade students focus on the founding of the republic. Grade six focuses on Europe and the Americas (but only to 1500), grade seven emphasizes Africa, Asia, and the Southwest Pacific (through colonization), and grade eight returns to a study of U.S. history (through Reconstruction).

The high school United States history course is a two semester class that builds upon previous study but emphasizes US development from the late nineteenth century to the present. According to an explanatory statement, students are to study "the key events, people, groups, and movements in the late nineteenth, twentieth, and early twenty-first centuries as they relate to life in Indiana and the United States." Nine standards are identified, organized chronologically and including a research component:

Standard 1: Early National Development: 1775-1877
Standard 2: Development of the Industrial United States: 1870-1900
Standard 3: Emergence of the Modern United States: 1897-1920
Standard 4: The Modern United States in Prosperity and Depression: 1920-1940
Standard 5: The United States and World War II: 1939-1945
Standard 6: Postwar United States: 1945-1960
Standard 7: The United States in Troubled Times: 1960-1980
Standard 8: The Contemporary United States: 1980 to the present
Standard 9: Historical Research

In the specific standards listed under these major headings, supporting content areas in the field of social studies are noted parenthetically.

The high school world history and civilization course is a two semester class emphasizing key developments in the world that have had an impact on subsequent eras. The explanatory overview states that students are "expected to practice skills and processes of historical thinking and inquiry that involve chronological thinking, comprehension, analysis and interpretation, research, issues-analysis and decision-making." Like in the US history standards, related content areas in social studies are indicated in parentheses. In both sets of standards it is emphasized that while one content area is the major focus of a course, other areas either play supporting roles or are integrated fully into the material. The 11 world history and civilization standards include:

Standard 1: Beginnings of Human Society
Standard 2: Early Civilizations: 4000 to 1000 B.C.E.
Standard 3: Classical Civilizations of Greece and Rome: 2000 B.C.E. to 500 C.E.
Standard 4: Major Civilizations, States, and Empires in Asia, Africa, and the Americas: 1000 B.C.E. to 1500 C.E.
Standard 5: Medieval Europe and the Rise of Western Civilization: 500 to 1500
Standard 6: The Renaissance and Reformation in Europe and the Development of Western Civilization: 1250-1650
Standard 7: Worldwide Exploration, Conquest, and Colonization: 1450-1750
Standard 8: Scientific, Political, and Industrial Revolutions: 1500 to 1900
Standard 9: Global Imperialism: 1750-1900
Standard 10: An Era of Global Conflicts, Challenges, Controversies, and Changes: 1900 to the Present
Standard 11: Historical Research

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION/EXIT EXAM

Indiana High Schools refer to the Core 40 Curriculum Chart for graduation requirements. The chart is divided into three categories, and in each category criteria are provided for a specific content area. The Core 40 program is recommended and aligned with state standards. The categories and required credits for history in the social studies area are:

High School Diploma	4 credits 2 U.S. History 1 U.S. Government 1 other social studies course or Global Economics or Consumer Economics
Core 40 Diploma	6 credits 2 U.S. History 1 U.S. Government 1 World History and Civ. and/or World Geog. 1 Economics 1 additional social studies course
Academic Honors Diploma	6 credits including U.S. History, U.S. Government, and others with an emphasis on Economics, geography, or world history

Exit Exam

In addition to taking specific classes, graduates of Indiana high schools must take a Graduation Qualifying Exam. The GQE measures ninth grade skills in English/language arts and mathematics. See Core 40 below.

ASSESSMENT

Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress Plus (ISTEP+) and Core 40 End-of Course Assessments are the primary measures of students' academic development in Indiana. ISTEP+ was created in 1995 when the General Assembly passed a law

requiring revisions of the current testing system (ISTEP). The law that mandated a norm-referenced test and a criterion-referenced component that includes both multiple choice responses and short answer and essay questions and the solving of mathematical problems. ISTEP+ is administered in the fall to students in grades 3, 6, 8, and 10 and measures material students should have mastered in grades 2, 5, 7, and 9. The criterion-referenced questions are aligned with the Indiana Academic Standards, while the norm-referenced questions cover a much broader range of materials.

ISTEP+ testing currently does not include social studies. In 2004 social studies was scheduled to be included for the fifth grade, while in 2006 it was to begin at the seventh grade level. It was scheduled to begin for ninth grade in 2008. The assessment in social studies has been suspended.

Core 40 end-of-course assessments measure what students know and are able to do after enrolling in specific Core 40 courses. In 2004 Core 40 assessments will be required. End-of-course assessments will be phased in after piloting over the next five years. A pilot for world history is temporarily scheduled for spring 2004, and a pilot for U.S. history is temporarily scheduled for spring 2005. Full implementation is scheduled for the following academic year in each area, respectively.

APPENDIX C: LIST OF RESPONDENTS TO THE SURVEY BY STATE

Alabama
Lewis W. Graydon

Alaska
Louie Yannotti

Arkansas
Ron Tolson
Steven Weber

California
John Burns

Colorado
Neil Deason
Brenda Ellis

Connecticut
Daniel W. Gregg
Joel Latman

Delaware
Joann Pruitt
Jacquelyn O. Wilson

Florida
Ralph Ricardo
Denise Scheidler
Theron Trimble

Georgia
Eddie Bennett
Judy Butler

Hawaii
Mary Anne Soboleski

Idaho
Ed Pfeifer

Illinois
Richard Carlson
John C. Craig

Indiana
Darrell Bigham
Chris McGrew

Kansas
Susan Helbert

Kentucky
Allison Bell
Robin Chandler
Rebecca Hanly

Louisiana
Richard A. Baker, Jr.

Maine
Connie Manter

Maryland
Bruce A. Lesh
Mark Stout
Marcie Taylor-Thoma

Massachusetts
Virginia Ahart
Sandra Stotsky
Dorothy Verheyen

Michigan
Sue Wittick

Minnesota
Charles Skemp

Missouri
Alberta M. Dougan
Joan M. Musbach
Warren Solomon

Nebraska
Robert Crosier
Larry K. Starr

Nevada
Robin Cobb
Chopin Kiang

New Hampshire
Kenneth J. Relihan

New Jersey
John Pyne

New Mexico
Patricia Concannon

New York
George M. Gregory
Betsy Guardenier
Charles C. Mackey, Jr.

North Carolina
Penny Maguire

North Dakota
Janet Placik Welk

Ohio
Donna Nesbitt

Oregon
Janet Madland
Andrea Morgan

Pennsylvania
Susan Rimby

Rhode Island
Luther Spoehr

South Carolina
Sherry Cashwell
Paul A. Horne, Jr.

South Dakota
Jerald Goehring
Gwen Rothenberger

Tennessee
Michelle Ungurait

Texas
Judy Brodigan

Vermont
Alice M. Evans

Virginia
Colleen Bryant
Paul Joseph
James A. Percoco

Wisconsin
Margaret Laughlin
Mark Schwingle

Wyoming
Adell VanPatten-Gomy

States Not Responding
Arizona
Iowa
Mississippi
Montana
Oklahoma
Utah
Washington
West Virginia
Washington, D.C.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank Arnita Jones of the American Historical Association and Lee Formwalt, John Dichtl, and Gwen Moore of the Organization of American Historians for their guidance in initiating and sponsoring this study. In addition, they wish to thank Marlissa Hughes, graduate student in curriculum studies at Indiana University, for her role in gathering data pertaining to resources and organizations for teacher membership in the states. Finally, they wish to thank Teresa Young for her assistance in preparing the document for publication.

About the Authors

Sarah Drake Brown is a doctoral candidate in curriculum studies in the School of Education at Indiana University, Bloomington. She also is a program assistant at Indiana University's Social Studies Development Center.

John J. Patrick is Director of the Social Studies Development Center, Director of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education, and a Professor in the School of Education of Indiana University, Bloomington.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: History Education in the United States: A Survey of Teacher Certification and State-Based Standards and Assessments For Teachers and Students	
Author(s): Sarah Drake Brown and John J. Patrick	
Corporate Source: Social Studies Development Center for Indiana University	Publication Date: 2003

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: John J. Patrick	Printed Name/Position/Title: John J. Patrick, Director, SSDC	
Organization/Address: Director, Social Studies Development Center, 2805 East Tenth Street, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47408	Telephone: 812-855-3838	FAX:
	E-Mail Address: patrick@indiana.edu	Date: 7-14-28, 2003

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC/CHESS
2805 E. Tenth Street, #120
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)